

REMARKS

Applicants have now revised the application in consideration of the comments and observations made during the telephone interview of December 27, 2002 and in view of the Advisory Action of November 13, 2002.

The Office Action and Advisory Action

Claims 1-18 were presented for examination.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication as to the allowance of claims 6-8 and 11-14, as well as the allowable subject matter in claims 9, 10, 15, 17 and 18.

Claims 1-5 and 16 stand rejected as being anticipated by Dhuler et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,962,949).

In the Advisory Action of November 13, 2002, a first Amendment After Final was not entered. The stated reasons were that certain proposed amendments to the claims related to the "electrical conductor material" and the amendment of claim 16 required additional consideration not appropriate.

Response to Advisory Action

In response to the Advisory Action, Applicants have cancelled claim 16 from further consideration. Further, during the telephonic interview, the discussion of changes to address § 112 issues were discussed, and the Examiner agreed that the proposed changes in this amendment are appropriate to provide consistent use of language. For these reasons, it is submitted the issues raised in the Advisory Action have been addressed.

The Claims Distinguish Over the Cited Art

In view of the cancellation of claim 16, Applicants then discussed during the telephonic interview the rejections of claims 1-5.

It was noted that in rejecting claim 1, layers 52 and 54 of Dhuler et al. were recited as being equivalent to the "ribbon hinge structure" of independent claim 1. Thereafter, heater 56 was recited as being equivalent to a "electrical conductor" (now amended to "electrical conductor material"), of claim 1. During the interview, Applicants explained the structural distinctions they believe to exist between Dhuler et al. and the language of claim 1.